



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,318	08/19/2003	Jaime Singson	OR03-04001	6010

51067 7590 08/22/2007  
ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION  
c/o PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 FIFTH STREET  
DAVIS, CA 95618-7759

EXAMINER
----------

DARNO, PATRICK A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2163

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/22/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/644,318	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SINGSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Patrick A. Darno	<b>Art Unit</b> 2163	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-16,18-29 and 31-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-16,18-29 and 31-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. No new claims have been added. Claims 4, 17, and 30 are cancelled. Claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-29, and 31-39 are pending in this office action.

***Affidavit – 37 C.F.R. 1.131***

2. The Examiner notes that the Affidavit submitted by Applicant is found to be in compliance with the rules set forth under 37 C.F.R. 1.131. Therefore, the Applicant has effectively sworn behind the Wu reference (i.e., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2005/0033726). In light of the Affidavit submitted under 37 C.F.R. 1.131, the Applicant now is entitled to a priority date of Jan. 10, 2003.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-29, and 31-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0037263 issued to Nishad Kamat et al. (hereinafter “Kamat”).

**Claim 1:**

Kamat discloses a method for facilitating data stewardship for metadata in a data warehouse system, comprising:

Art Unit: 2163

creating metadata, under the control of a user, for use in the data warehouse system  
(Kamat: paragraph [0006], lines 16-21 and paragraphs [0061] - [0063] paragraph [0069] and paragraph [0073] and paragraph [0074], lines 1-11);

moving the metadata, under the control of a super user (Kamat: paragraph [0066], lines 9-10;  
The administrator with overall privileges is the "super user".), into and out of a collection, thereby  
securing the metadata (Kamat: paragraph [0006], lines 16-21 and paragraphs [0061] - [0063] paragraph [0069]  
and paragraph [0073] and paragraph [0074], lines 1-11; The Kamat reference clearly states that a user, if given  
proper authority, can perform such activities as reading, writing, deleting, modifying, and the like. Surely writing  
and deleting data to and from a collection respectively can be interpreted as moving data into and out of a  
collection.);

assigning under the control of the super user, a data steward for the collection (Kamat:  
paragraph [0066], lines 9-13 and paragraph [0066] in its entirety and paragraphs [0064] - [0065] and paragraphs  
[0058] - [0060]; As noted above, the administrator with overall privileges is the "super user". This administrator,  
or "super user", has the authority to assign a user with a certain "role". Each role varies in amount of and type of  
access to a data collection each is entitled to. So the administrator can authorize "data stewards" as well as a variety  
of other levels of users as the administrator or "super user" sees fit (Kamat: paragraph [0066]).); and

manipulating, under the control of the data steward, the metadata in the collection (Kamat:  
paragraph [0006], lines 16-21 and paragraphs [0061] - [0063] paragraph [0069] and paragraph [0073] and  
paragraph [0074], lines 1-11), wherein manipulating the metadata involves securing the metadata and  
performing administration operations on the collection (Kamat: paragraph [0005] and paragraph [0019]  
and paragraph [0066]), wherein only the data steward can manipulate the metadata in the collection,  
and wherein manipulating the metadata includes editing and deleting metadata (Kamat: paragraph

Art Unit: 2163

[0066] and paragraph [0006], lines 16-21 and paragraphs [0061] - [0065] paragraph [0069] and paragraph [0073] and paragraph [0074], lines 1-11).

**Claim 2:**

Kamat discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Kamat further discloses a method further comprising moving metadata, under the control of a collection administrator, into and out of the collection (Kamat: paragraph [0006], lines 16-21 and paragraphs [0061] - [0063] paragraph [0069] and paragraph [0073] and paragraph [0074], lines 1-11; The Kamat reference clearly states that a user, if given proper authority, can perform such activities as reading, writing, deleting, modifying, and the like. Surely writing and deleting data to and from a collection respectively can be interpreted as moving data into and out of a collection.).

**Claim 3:**

Kamat discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Kamat further discloses wherein the data steward includes more than one individual (Kamat: paragraph [0066]; Note that roles can be individual users or groups of users consisting of more than one individual.).

**Claim 5:**

Kamat discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Kamat further discloses wherein the collection is related to a specified domain (Kamat: paragraph [0005] and paragraph [0019] and paragraph [0060]; As an example, Kamat suggests using the invention in the business domain. Therefore, there are collections related to various types of items in the business domain such as customers and sales (Kamat: paragraphs [0061] and [0064])).).

Art Unit: 2163

**Claim 6:**

Kamat discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Kamat further discloses wherein the data steward can be a data steward for more than one collection (*Kamat: paragraph [0066]; The overall administrator grants permissions to collections of data as the administrator sees fit. If the administrator wishes that a given user be permitted to be a "data steward" for more than one collection, the administrator can grant permissions or roles to that user accordingly.*).

**Claim 7:**

Kamat discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Kamat further discloses wherein the super user has access to the metadata within a plurality of collections (*Kamat: paragraph [0066]; Note that the overall administrator has overall privileges to manipulate all resources.*).

**Claim 8:**

Kamat discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Kamat further discloses wherein the metadata includes data descriptions (*Kamat: paragraphs [0061] - [0063] and note the tables in between these paragraphs*).

**Claim 9:**

Kamat discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Kamat further discloses wherein the metadata can include procedures related to the data warehouse system (*Kamat: paragraph [0060]*).

**Claim 10:**

Kamat discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Kamat further discloses:

creating, under the control of the user, a new metadata (*Kamat: paragraph [0006], lines 16-21 and paragraphs [0061] - [0063] paragraph [0069] and paragraph [0073] and paragraph [0074], lines 1-11*); and

requesting, under the control of the user, that the new metadata be moved to the collection (*Kamat: paragraph [0006], lines 16-21 and paragraphs [0061] - [0063] paragraph [0069] and paragraph [0073] and paragraph [0074], lines 1-11*; *The Kamat reference clearly states that a user, if given proper authority, can perform such activities as reading, writing, deleting, modifying, and the like. Surely writing data to a collection can be interpreted as moving data into a collection.*).

**Claim 11:**

Kamat discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Kamat further discloses manipulating metadata, under the control of the user, that the user owns and that does not belong to the collection (*Kamat: paragraph [0066]*; *Again, the overall administrator has the authority to grant permissions to a user to access a given set of resources. The access to files is determined by the administrator (or "super user") and is a design choice.*).

**Claim 12:**

Kamat discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Kamat further discloses creating metadata, under the control of the data steward, within a folder in the collection, wherein creating metadata within the folder automatically causes the metadata to be added to the collection (*Kamat: paragraph [0006], lines 16-21 and paragraphs [0061] - [0063] paragraph [0069] and paragraph [0073] and paragraph [0074], lines 1-11*).

**Claim 13:**

Kamat discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Kamat further discloses wherein only the super user can create/delete a collection; and wherein only the super user can update the collection by moving metadata to/from the collection (*Kamat: paragraph [0066] and paragraph [0006], lines 16-21 and paragraphs [0061] - [0063] paragraph [0069] and paragraph [0073] and paragraph [0074], lines 1-11; Again, specific "roles" assigned to specific users are assigned in any way the administrator (super user) sees fit.*).

**Claim 14:**

Claim 14 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 1 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

**Claim 15:**

Claim 15 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 2 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

**Claim 16:**

Claim 16 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 3 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 3.

**Claim 18:**

Claim 18 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 5 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5.

**Claim 19:**

Claim 19 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 6 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 6.



**Claim 20:**

Claim 20 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 7 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 7.

**Claim 21:**

Kamat discloses all the elements of claim 14, as noted above, and Kamat further discloses wherein more than one data steward can be a data steward for a specified collection (*Kamat: paragraph [0066]; The overall administrator grants permissions to collections of data as the administrator sees fit. If the administrator wishes that a given user be permitted to be a "data steward" for more than one collection, the administrator can grant permissions or roles to that user accordingly.*).

**Claim 22:**

Claim 22 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 9 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 9.

**Claim 23:**

Claim 23 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 10 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 10.

**Claim 24:**

Claim 24 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 11 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 11.

**Claim 25:**

Claim 25 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 12 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 12.

Art Unit: 2163

**Claim 26:**

Claim 26 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 13 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 13.

**Claim 27:**

Claim 27 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 1 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

**Claim 28:**

Claim 28 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 2 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

**Claim 29:**

Claim 29 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 3 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 3.

**Claim 31:**

Claim 31 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 5 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5.

**Claim 32:**

Claim 32 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 6 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 6.

**Claim 33:**

Claim 33 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 7 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 7.

Art Unit: 2163

**Claim 34:**

Claim 34 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 8 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 8.

**Claim 35:**

Claim 35 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 9 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 9.

**Claim 36:**

Claim 36 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 10 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 10.

**Claim 37:**

Claim 37 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 11 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 11.

**Claim 38:**

Claim 38 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 12 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 12.

**Claim 39:**

Claim 39 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 13 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 13.

***Response to Arguments***

**Examiner Notes:**

Any arguments/remarks of record with respect to this application are now moot in light of new grounds of rejection.


***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick A. Darno whose telephone number is (571) 272-0788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PAD

  
Hong w  
for SPT Don Wong

Patrick A. Darno  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2163

